

ΧΡΙΣΤΙΝΑΣ Β. ΔΕΔΟΥΣΗ

Τακτικής Καθηγήτριας της Κλασικής Φιλολογίας

THE NEW COMEDY PROLOGUE OF PAP. ARGENTOR. GR. 53:
ITS INTERPRETATION AND AUTHORSHIP

The Pap. Argentor. Gr. 53 found in an unknown place in Egypt was edited in 1899 by G. Kaibel (ed. pr.)¹. It consists of a single piece from a roll, containing on its back side a text written in a column partly preserved. The text forms 29 iambic trimeters, which are all mutilated: their left part is missing. The missing text in the five top lines is half of each trimeter but in the rest of the lines it is confined to a part of the first metron. W. Croenert² dated it to the end of the 1st cent. A. D. and this date is accepted by general consent (as far as I know). E. G. Turner suggested³ a different date: near the end of the 2nd cent.

Kaibel's editio princeps was followed by a series of editions⁴, which were different mainly in their supplements of the gaps. The text did not present any difficulty concerning its identification: it contains a New Comedy prologue⁵; but this prologue was discussed for its form and content and was given an interpretation, which dated it vaguely in a «later» period of evolution in the history of New Comedy, that is later than Menander. When the Pap. Argentor. Gr. 53 appeared, the scholars were discussing eagerly the origin of the two characteristics found in the Latin Comedy: 1) the personified Prologus (Plautus, Terence), and 2) the literary criticism combined with personal attack (Terence). A Greek origin of the first characteristic was suggested by some scholars. Reitzenstein⁶ mainly saw in this prologue evidence of a Greek origin of Terence's prologues, based on the interpre-

1. Ein Komödienprolog, *NGG* (1899) 549-555. Fr. 252, *CGF* Austin.

2. *APF* 1 (1901) 515.

3. Professor E. G. Turner kindly wrote to me his opinion after having examined photographs of this papyrus. The text on the inside looks like a corn register and it is not intelligible. He is inclined to put its date in the 2nd cent. A. D. The literary text on the outside of this papyrus is accordingly dated towards the end of the 2nd cent. A. D.

4. See the last edition by C. Austin (*CGF* in papyris reperta, n. 252. p. 271) for the editions and the relevant bibliography.

5. All the editors and the interpreters of this text think that this prologue is almost complete. The question about its form and length will be discussed in the following pages.

6. *Hermes* 35(1900) 625f.

tation of the criticism against the loquacious gods in this prologue as an expression of its poet's opinion about his art and as an opposition to other poets, who wrote long prologues. This prologue then was given the special importance of an evidence showing a later development in the evolution of the New Comedy prologue: the short exposition and introduction to the story. This short exposition is combined with the poet's opinion about his art and his opposition to his rivals. The Terentian prologue is the final step of the evolution according to Reitzenstein, where there is not any exposition at all in the prologue: the introduction to the comedy is done in the first scenes of the play and the prologue has become personal and literary. It is notable that, when Reitzenstein gave this interpretation to Pap. Argentor. 53, Menander was known only from very few papyrus fragments; the big discovery of the Cairo Menander came a few years later. But today Menander's imposing Oxford volume gives substantial help for a new examination of this comic prologue, in order to base an interpretation on the text itself, in relation to other similar or different prologues. There is always the danger, when one is seeking for evidence in order to prove a theory which will solve some problem, to adapt the interpretation of a text to one's theory.

Doubts about Reitzenstein's theory were expressed only by Weil¹: since the poets of New Comedy were influenced by Euripides, and the latter gave examples of a variety of prologues, Menander as well could use a variety of prologues. Accordingly one cannot see in this prologue a novelty and a new period in the history of the comic prologue, but simply an exceptional case, something which other poets as well could have done accidentally either before or after the time of this prologue. Weil's thoughts are proved to be right concerning the variety of the known Menandrian prologues. What about the majority of his unknown prologues?

The reexamination of Pap. Argentor. Gr. 53 (in photographs) did not give anything important apart from its different dating. There is in fact very little to be added to its last edition by C. Austin²: 8: the traces of the letter before ἀγκωνισαμένοις show a C. 9: the letter O of the word ὀχληρᾶν is visible on the papyrus. 16: the trace of the first letter is rather too thick to belong to a Y, a N is possible. Since

1. Un nouveau prologue de comédie, *REG* 13 (1900) 430 f.

2. See *CGF* p. 271 f.

the iota προσγεγραμμένον is always omitted in this papyrus, it could be better if it were added in the text as ὑπογεγραμμένον.

To the following text of Pap. Argentor. Gr. 53 I have added the supplements which I take more or less as certain. There is no way of calculating the exact number of the missing letters at the beginning of the lines.

-]ε μακρολόγος θε[ός
 ἀ]κούοντας λάβη
]αρος πειρωμένους
 τ] ὁ πρῶτον ὄν τρόπον
 5] καὶ τὸ δεύτερον πάλιν
] ταιου δὲ καὶ τὰς αἰτίας
 καὶ τὰς ἀπ]οδείξεις ἐξ ἀνάγκης γίνεται
] .αγωνισαμένους ῥῆσιν λέγειν
] ὀχληρὰν ἐκδιδάσκοντας σαφῶς
 10 κάκτιθε]μένους καθ' ἕκαστον, ὧν εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι
 οὐθεὶς μ]εμάθηκεν οὐθέν, ἀλλὰ τοῦθ' ὄρα,
 πότ' ἀπει]σιν· ὑμᾶς δ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης βούλομαι
 ν]οῆσαι καὶ θεοῦ τι, νῆ Δία,
 ἀξίον ἐνε]γχεῖν αὐτός, ἀλλ' ὄντως θεοῦ
 15 Διον]ύσῳ γὰρ τι πιστεύειν, ἐμοί.
 ἐγένο]ντο Σωσθένης καὶ Δημέας
 ἀδ]ελφοὶ δύο πότ', εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας
 ἔγ]ημαν οἰκίας· καὶ γίνεται
 α]υτῶν θυγάτριον δὲ θατέρῳ
 20 ἐπειτ' ἀ]ποδημία τις ἀμφοτέροις ἅμα
 ἦν εἰς Ἀ]σίαν ἐκεῖ τε περὶ τῶν σωμάτων
 κίνδυνο]ς· εἰρχθέντος γὰρ αὐτῶν θατέρου
]ην σχόντος τιν' ἄδικος ἄτερος
] τῆν σωτηρίαν. ἔπειθ' ὁ μὲν
 25] λαθῶν, ὁ δ' ἐκεῖνον ἐκκλέψαι δοκῶν
] διὰ τοῦτο· καὶ γέγονεν ἐκκαίδεκα
] τὸ μῆκος τῆς ἀποδημίας ἔτη.
] τις ἂν φήσειεν ἀμφοτέροις ἅμα
] τοσοῦτων; καὶ τί τὰναγκαῖον ἦν

The identification of the speaker in this prologue is very important for its interpretation. Kaibel's opinion that the speaker here is Dionysos (based on the supplement of v. 15 Διον]ύσῳ) was queried by

Reitzenstein¹, who proposed a «real god», Apollo or Hermes, and by Weil², who proposed an actor representing the poet. Editors views differ: Page accepts with little doubt Dionysos, Demianczuk follows rather Reitzenstein, Schroeder and Austin do not decide, and Edmonds supposes some personification.

A comparison of this fragmentary prologue to the existing prologues of Menander shows that Kaibel's opinion was right. It is expected from the speaker of a prologue to introduce himself to the spectators, although the prologue-speaker could usually be identified by sight (e. g. Pan in the *Dyskolos*). In v. 15 the prologue god introduces himself: Διον]ύσω γάρ τι πιστεύειν, ἐμοί. The infinitive (πιστεύειν) needs a verb like δεῖ and the subject ὑμᾶς is understood. Ἐμοί stands in apposition to Διον]ύσω. Cf. the following passages from Menander: *Aspis* 98 (Τύχη) θεόν οὖσαν οὐκ ἦν εἰκὸς ἀκολουθεῖν ἐμέ. *Aspis* 147 f. (Τύχη) τίς εἰμι· πάντων κυρία τούτων βραβεῦσαι καὶ διοικῆσαι, Τύχη (Austin). *Dyskolos* 10 f. (Πάν) προσηγόρευκε... πλὴν ἐξ ἀνάγκης...ἐμὲ τὸν Πᾶνα. *Perikeir.* 140 f. (Ἄγνοια) μὴ ποτε δι' ἐμέ τι τὴν Ἄγνοια αὐτοῖς συμπέση. The self-identification is not confined, of course, to the speakers of the prologues: see *Aspis* 14 ἐγὼ δ' ὁ παιδαγωγός, <δ> Κλεόστρατε. *Dyskolos* 398 f. κατακέκομμ' ἐγὼ ὁ μάγειρος. *Fr.* 794 μάλιστα δ' οἱ Γέται ἡμεῖς.

Dionysos says³: «(I am not) a loquacious god (so that there is no danger to you) listeners of falling asleep (as happens with other gods), who use abundant words, in order to give you all the possible details of the story of the play—what happened, how, and why. And thus it becomes necessary to them to narrate a long tedious story for people who lean on their elbows⁴, expounding everything in detail, while, I am sure, nobody understands a word of what they say. But I myself want you to be compelled to understand and to tell you something (worthy), by Zeus, of a god, I mean of a real god, because (you must) trust Dionysos, that is me (vv. 1-15).

In the next twelve lines (16-27) Dionysos gives a summary of events relevant to the story of this play: «there were once upon a time two brothers, Sosthenes and Demeas. They married and used to live in (these two) adjacent houses. To the one of the brothers a son was

1. See p. 255 note 6, op. cit. p. 626.

2. See p. 256 note 1, op. cit. p. 428.

3. I put in parentheses the minimum of the necessary additions to the existing fragmentary text, in order to make it intelligible.

4. The meaning of the word]αγκωνισαμένους is discussed in p. 265 f.

born, to the other a daughter. Afterwards they went abroad together to Asia, where their lives (were in danger). The one was put in jail unjustly. The other tried to rescue him. Then the first escaped, but the second was accused of smuggling him out (and he was punished) for that. Their absence lasted sixteen years. Someone will now ask: why were both the brothers away from their home for so many years? What was the necessity?» Here the text breaks off. By general consent it is believed that this prologue is preserved almost in its entire form, and that only a very brief answer to the questions is missing. Kaibel supposes¹ that an answer like «Plautus noluit» (*Casina* 65) was perhaps enough, i. e. «because the poet liked them to do so». But the «Plautus noluit» is found in the prologue of the *Casina*, which has clear signs of a later composition, and anyway in the case of the *Casina* there is a personified Prologus, who does not finish his speech with the «Plautus noluit». On the contrary the Prologus goes on saying (67f): Sunt hic, inter se quos nunc credo dicere: «quaeso hercle, quid istuc est? serviles nuptiae?» These questions can be taken as a parallel case to Dionysos' questions in our prologue. In the *Casina* the Prologus explains to the audience that marriages between slaves are possible in some countries, makes a joke (75-78) and returns to the narration of the story. Reitzenstein² supposed that the questions in the last lines of our prologue were followed by an ending like «you will hear the answers from the play itself», referring to two of the three existing typical endings of Latin prologues: Terence *Adelphi* 22-24 and Plautus *Vidul.* 10f. To these add *Trinummus* 16f. But this kind of ending a prologue cannot have a place in this prologue, because the information given so far by Dionysos is insufficient. It is rather improbable to accept that the god informed the audience about the two brothers only and said nothing about their wives and children, who live in the houses represented on the stage, the more so because they must be very important persons in this drama, especially the two children. It is almost impossible to suppose that anything else happened than that the two brothers on their return home met with family problems and difficulties. It is to be expected also that the prologue god will himself be involved in some way in the story of the comedy — at least this is always the case in the existing prologues — and there is no reason to suppose, that the same does not apply to our prologue as well. The

1. See p. 255 note 1, op. cit. p. 554.

2. See p. 255 note 6, loc. cit. A discussion on these typical endings will follow.

sixteen years of the brothers' absence is indicative of a love story, as was rightly noted by Kaibel (loc. cit. in p. 259 note 1). At the age of sixteen the girls in comedy attract their first lover¹, and this means that in this comedy as well there was at least one love story, in which the daughter was involved. Various suppositions are possible: e. g. the two cousins fell in love with each other, or the boy was involved in a love affair with a free born girl or an *ἐπαίρα*, or a free born girl who was sold to a pimp, etc. Various things could also happen to the girl. Therefore one cannot consider this prologue as almost complete, as it was believed till now. Our text is only a part of a prologue; the important part of the introduction to the play is missing.

A great god, Dionysos, speaks this prologue beginning with criticism against the loquacious gods (who usually were given the part of the prologue in comedies), accusing them of delivering very long and tedious speeches. These loquacious gods are inferior ones (e. g. in Menander "Ἡρώς, Πάν, "Αγνοία, Τύχη). It is notable that Dionysos needs 15 lines to say only that he himself is going to be very brief, unlike the other (inferior) gods, who deliver very lengthy introductory speeches. Evidently he is meant by the poet of this prologue to be funny by being himself talkative in describing what the *μακρολόγοι θεοὶ* do. The partly preserved introductory narrative to the story of his comedy is preceded by the comic invention of a superior god making fun of the inferior gods. But is the poet of this prologue expressing here seriously his opinion about how he thinks a good prologue must be composed, as is unanimously accepted by the scholars? The following discussion will show that the answer is negative.

The evidence, which this prologue brings, is to a certain extent similar to what we find in prologues of existing comedies (Greek and Latin). The need of an introduction to complicated plots could be the cause of composing long prologues and presenting garrulous gods as well as garrulous humans, who were given the part of the prologue. But at the same time their loquacity was exploited by the poets for comic effects. In Menander's Fr. 152 (*Ἐπίκληρος*), which belongs to the prologue of the play, the speaker (presumably an old man) explains that the sleeplessness is certainly the most garrulous thing, because it has sent him out of his house to narrate his whole life from the begin-

1. See e. g. Plaut. *Casina* 39 (Prologus) sed abhinc annos factum est sedecim quom... puellam exponi. Terent. *Eunuchus* 318.

ning to the present time¹. Evidently this is an introduction to a following long narrative². Charinus, the young lover in Plautus' *Mercator* (from Philemon's *Ἐμπορος*), who speaks a long prologue (110 verses), criticises the other young lovers in comedies, who address the Night, Sun, etc.³, and he asks the spectators to forgive his loquacity (v. 37 *nunc mi irasci ob multiloquium non decet*). In the Prologus of Plautus' *Menaechni* (11-16), there is the metaphor: argumentum=ration, with many details—with plenty of corn. The Prologus says that he is going to give the spectators their ration (the story of the comedy), which will be counted neither by hundred kilos of corn, nor by tons, but by whole store houses, because he is very friendly to them. This is another comic exploitation of a long narrative. On the contrary the god Pan in Menander's *Dyskolos* says that he gives the *κεφάλαια* only of the story and that the spectators will learn the details from the play itself, if they want to (45 f.): ταῦτ] ἐστὶ τὰ κεφάλαια· τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα δὲ ὕψεσθ', ἐὰν βούλησθε — βουλῆθητε δέ. It seems that these two verses of the *Dyskolos* are also repeated at the end of the prologue in Menander's *Sikyonios* (23f.), and this means that they form a kind of formula. Sandbach⁴ sees some resemblance in the imperative βουλῆθητε to the injunction to the audience: *adeste* (Plautus *Amphitryo* 151): *date...* *operam* (*Asin.* 14) etc. The need of a speaker to be clear but not tiresome with superfluous details, is expressed in other parts of a play besides the prologue: Timocles Fr. 8, 13 (Edmonds) ἵνα μὴ δὲ πολλὰ μακρολογῶ δι' ἡμέρας. Pap. Ant. 55 (Austin *CGF*, tr. 242) 14f. λογισμὸν ὧν μέλλεις διοικε[ῖν πραγ]μάτων σαυτῶι δὲ, ἐν ὀλίγοις δὲ καὶ μὴ διὰ μακρῶν.

In Plautus' *Trinummus* (from Philemon's *Θησαυρός*) the goddess Luxuria, who speaks the prologue, introduces to the audience her daughter Inopia and herself, explains their movements into and out of a

1. The first verse of Fr. 152 does not need any question mark. Cf. Fr. 338 and 360 (see Denniston *Gr. Part.* p. 48 n. 2 and Dedoussi *Μενάνδρου Σαμία*, p. 39f.). A. Borgogno (*RhM* 114, 1971, p. 287f.) proposed the correction of Menander's Γνωμαι Μονόστιχοι v. 53 (Jaekel) ἄρ' ἐστὶ πάντων ἄγρυπνία καλλίστατον, identifying this verse with the first verse of Menander's Fr. 152 ἄρ' ἐστὶ πάντων ἄγρυπνία καλλίστατον. The following v. 54 also in the same collection of γνωμαι (=Men. *Kithar.* Fr. 1, 8) does not need any question mark.

2. Cf. the prologue of the *Samia* 19f.: Moschion gives a long narrative because he has much time at his disposal.

3. Cf. the prologue of the *Misoumenos* (A1, Sandbach) and Pap. Antinoop. 15, 4f. (Sandbach p. 327).

4. See *A Comment. to Menander*, p. 143 (on *Dyskolos* 46).

house on the stage and she adds (16 f.): *sed de argumento ne expectetis fabulae; senes qui huc venient, ei rem vobis aperient*. Almost the same words are repeated in the Prologus¹ of Terences's *Adelphi* (from Menander's *Ἀδελφοί*): *dehinc ne expectetis argumentum fabulae, senes qui primi venient i partem aperient, in agendo partem ostendent* (22 ff.). The case in Terence's Prologus is surprising, because none of his Prologi contains an *argumentum*, that is an introductory summary of the plot. A variation of the same sense is found in the prologue of Plautus' *Vidularia*: *credo argumentum velle vos pernoscere, intelletetis potius quid agant quando agant* (10 f.). This coincidence shows, I think, that here as well there is a kind of formula, which is used for cutting short and ending a prologue, similar to the one discussed above. It does not seem probable that this way of cutting short a prologue is a Latin invention; the case in the prologue of Terence's *Adelphi* shows that the presence of this formula can be explained as due to the influence of the Greek originals.

The long prologue exists together with the loquacity and its comic exploitation; on the other hand there is also the tendency of giving only the indispensable information about the plot and then asking the spectators to watch with attention the performance of the play in order to get all the details they need to know. In the case of *Luxuria's* prologue (*Trinummus*) there is a short introduction to the play. The Latin comic poets could use from the variety of the Greek prologues they had at their disposal — unknown, of course, to us — any kind they found suitable to their particular plays. It seems that they invented the personified Prologus as a special role, as we find it in Plautus, who uses the other kinds of prologue as well, and Terence, who uses it exclusively. There is no evidence in Greek comedy of a personified prologue, as an independent role, representing either the director of the company or the poet himself. The literary quarrel, which is the main theme of Terence's prologues, is confined only to this comic poet, as it is stated by the poet himself and by Eugraphius in his commentary on the pro-

1. The prologue in Terence is always a personified figure, the Prologus, representing the poet or the company director. This development of the prologue is not found so far in the Greek Νέξ and it seems that Eugraphius (*De comoedia*, III 2 p. 65, Kaibel) is right stating that «*tum etiam Graeci prologos non habent more nostrorum, quos Latini habent*». He means probably the personified prologue, as it was supposed by Dziatzko and Fabia, but refuted by Leo, who thought that the text of Eugraphius was corrupted (see the discussion in *Plaut. Forsch.*², p. 224f.).

logue of the *Andria*¹. When Eugraphius says that Terence did not use the prologus in the way the other poets do, because of Luscius Lanuvinus' slanders, he relies mainly on what Terence himself said in his prologues². Terence and the Romans in general imitated probably the Greeks in their literary quarrels as well, but the question is whether the papyrus 53 of Strassburg shows or not the Greek origin of Terence's literary quarrel, as Reitzenstein thought. The answer must be negative, because according to the preceding discussion there is nothing really different or unusual in this part of a prologue, compared with the other existing prologues of New Comedy, and one must not forget how few of them are known to us. In this fragment the introduction to the story of a comedy is preceded by the derision of the garrulous gods done by Dionysos, who is not only a superior god but also the god of the theatre, able to express an authorised opinion about theatrical matters. There is here a clever comic device showing an expert poet, who combines a funny and pleasant beginning of a prologue -- the derision of the garrulous gods in a garrulous way --, with the excitement of the spectator's favour: this god spares them the tedium of a long speech. The criticism against the long prologues is not to be taken as the poet's serious opinion about the length of the comic prologue, and much less as an attack on other poets, who wrote long prologues. It is rather absurd to suppose a poet restricting himself to only one form of a prologue and renouncing the possibility of a choice from various forms and lengths according to the needs of each particular play. And since the success of each particular play in the theatre is the poet's main concern, the prologue is a crucial point for making a good impression on the spectators, particularly of its first performance. Moreover the success of a comedy to a great extent depended on the comic invention and originality shown by the drama-

1. Eugraphi Commentum (Wessner III 1, p. 3): omnis prologus triplici inducitur causa: vel ut argumentum fabulae possit exhibere vel poetam populo commendare vel a populo audientiam postulet. Sed his omnibus causis Terentius non ita usus est: habuit enim adversarium veterem poetam Luscium Lanuinum, cuius comoediae cum non placerent, semper maledictis adversus comoedias Terenti pugnabat. propter hunc igitur Terentius prologum semper inducit, ut eius maledictis respondeat. quod si ita est, omnis prologus Terenti habet controversiam.

2. *Andria* 5ff. nam in prologis scribundis operam abutitur, non qui argumentum narret, sed qui malevoli veteris poetae maledictis respondeat. *Heauton*. 11 oratorem esse voluit me, non prologum. *Phormio* 12-15 nunc si quis est qui hoc dicat aut sic cogitet: «vetus si poeta non lacessisset prior, nullum invenire prologum potuisset novus quem diceret, nisi haberet cui male diceret...»

tist, and these are expected to be present from the very beginning of the play. One has to remember the surprises brought to us with Menander's every new text.

There is, for a comparison, a similar case in the Prologus of Plautus' *Captivi*: the Prologus (personified and representing a member of the company) informs the spectators that the play they are going to perform is unusual, because there is no filthy language in it and all the characters are respectable persons. They are not going to see in this performance any courtesan or pimp etc. (v. 53-58). This notification cannot mean that the composer of these lines expresses in them his opinion about the art of comedy, namely that only respectable characters must be represented on the comic stage. Much less, of course, can we see here a criticism against the poets, who represented in their comedies characters of low morals. The poet here wants to ensure the success of this particular comedy by advertising it and so exciting the interest of the spectators. There is also the case in the prologue of the *Mercator*, which contains criticism. Charinus begins by saying that he is not going to do what the other lovers in comedies usually do; but this is not literary criticism, because the poet does not in fact express here his opinion about how and to whom must the lovers expound their problems. The poet simply wants by stressing his originality in this particular case to attract the attention of his audience and ensure the success of his play. The comic poets apparently wanted to avoid as much as they could the comic commonplaces and when they succeeded in doing so, they wanted to stress the fact and make it recognisable to the audience. Similarly the poet of the comic fragment in the Pap. Heid. 184 fr. 11 (Sandbach p. 337, Austin *CGF*, tr. 244, v. 221 ff.) exploits for comic effect the opposition of his cook to the other μάγειροι of the comedy, who are usually represented as petty thieves without imagination.

This comic prologue does not in fact contain anything comparable to the Terentian literary criticism and quarrel, and it can not be taken as evidence of the origin of the Terentian prologue. On the other hand no theory about the evolution of the prologue in New Comedy can be supported by the existing evidence, and consequently there is no way of arranging the existing types of prologue in a chronological order. Reitzenstein's theory (loc. cit.) was that the long prologue spoken by a god comes first, the short one was invented later and was spoken by an actor in the name of the poet, and that in the final stage there was nothing in the prologue about the plot— the prologue became literary and personal, as

it is in Terence. This theory is perhaps ingenious but without foundation. And since this fragmentary prologue is similar to the other existing prologues, its date of composition as well can be the same, that is the time of Menander and his contemporary poets of New Comedy. Furthermore the following results of the examination of the vocabulary and style not only confirm this dating, but also give some indications for a possible Menandrian authorship.

1 μακρολόγος: Pseudepicharmea (Axiopistos?) 86, 11 (CGF Austin). Cf. μακρολογία, Arist. *Rhet.* 1418 b 25, and the formula ἵνα μὴ μακρολογῶ, Timocl. Fr. 8, 13 (Edmonds), Demosth. 11, 23; 14, 7, and the variation ἵνα μὴ μακρὰ λέγων ἐνοχλῶ, 14, 41.

2 ὕπνος]...λάβη: Soph. *Phil.* 766 f., Alexis Fr. 277, 2.

4-5 τὸ πρῶτον... καὶ τὸ δεύτερον: Menander *Aspis* 284 ff. τὸ μὲν πρῶτον...δεύτερον δέ.

6 αἰτίας: Damoxenos Fr. 2, 47 f. λέγω τὰς αἰτίας καὶ τάποβαῖνον.

7 ἀποδείξεις: (=expositions) Dionysios Fr. 3, 4: τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῆς τέχνης αἰτῶ σ' ἐγώ.

-- ἐξ ἀνάγκης: Men. *Dysk.* 11 (prologue), *Sam.* 611 (Sandbach).

8]. ἀγκωνισαμένοις: the meaning of this word is not clear. The verb ἀγκωνίζω is not found in the middle form elsewhere and the only case of the active form (ἀγκωνισωμεν), which is attested in the Glossaria (Goetz, III p. 287) is given the explanation accumbamus (for taking part in a symposium). The same participle, compound with the preposition ἀπὸ (ἀπαγκωνισάμενος), was used, according to Phot. Berol. 154, 5, by Archippos (?Ιχθύες), with the meaning σεμνῶς πάνυ. This explanation is not satisfactory and possibly there is here a corruption in the text¹. There follows the information that «they used also the word ἀγκωνίζειν» presumably to express the same meaning² (ἔλεγον δὲ καὶ ἀγκωνίζειν). Hesychios attests twice (the mss give more cases, which were corrected by the editors) the verb ἀπαγκωνίζομαι: the same participle ἀπαγκωνισάμενοι is explained ἐκτείναντες τοὺς ἀγκῶνας and the participle ἀπηγκωνισμένος is explained ἐν σχήματι τὸν ἀγκῶνα ἀποτετακώς. The stretching of the elbows and the stretching of the whole

1. Obviously the Phot. Berol. gives the adverb omitting the verb, unless the σεμνῶς πάνυ does not belong to an interpretation, but it is a comment made by the lexicographer: «very stately» i. e. said.

2. I cannot see how in the LSJ dictionary the ἀπαγκωνίζομαι of Archippos' fragment is explained «bare the elbows». If one is to follow the Phot. Berol. ἀπαγκωνίζομαι has a similar meaning to ἀγκωνίζω, and in this case its meaning is quite opposite to the «bare the elbows», presumably for setting at work.

arm with the elbows bent are movements, which one usually makes, when either one is benumbed (after sitting motionless for a long time) or one feels sleepy. Consequently there are two ways for interpreting the]. *αγκωνισαμένοις* of the text: either it means that the spectators reclined on their elbows, or that they stretched themselves. But in both cases there is the same cause: the tiresome speech of a *μακρολόγος θεός*. The first interpretation is preferable, because the past tense of the participle is better understood with this meaning. The meaning of reclining on their elbows is also understood, in the case of sitting people, as supporting the elbows on their knees.

— ῥῆσιν λέγειν: Menander *Epitr.* ἐρῶ σοι ῥῆσιν.

9 ἐκδιδάσκοντας σαφῶς: Eupolis Fr. 353 ἀδολεσχεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκδιδάζον. Cf. Menander *Epitr.* 799 σαφῶς διδάξω σε. The position of σαφῶς at the end of the verse appears often in Menander: *Misoum.* 151, 283, *Phasma* 51, *Epitr.* 156, 557, *Sam.* 566, Fr. 547.

10 καθ' ἕκαστον: Mnesimachos Fr. 4, 29 καθ' ἕκαστα λέγων. Menander *Dysk.* 45 (prologue) τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα and *Sikyoni.* 23 (prologue):

— εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι: Menander *Dysk.* 13 (prologue).

11 οὐθεις μ]εμάθηκεν οὐθέν: Menander *Apsis* 113 (prologue) ταυτὶ μὲν οὖν μεμαθήκατε ἱκανῶς, *Aspis* 100 (prologue) τοῦτο δέ...] ἔχων μαθήσεται. Alexis Fr. 277, 3 οὐδ' ἂν λέγει τις οὐδαμῶς μάθοιμεν ἄν.

13-14 καὶ θεοῦ τι, νῆ Δία, / ἄξιον: Menander *Aspis* 318 f. καὶ μὴν ἄξιον φιλονικίας νῆ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν. *Samia* 442 f. πάνυ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἄξιον, νῆ τὸν Δία, ἐπιδακρῦσαι.

15 Διονύσφ γάρ τι, πιστεύειν, ἐμοί: Menander *Dysk.* 210 ff. (prologue) προσηγόρευκε... πλήν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἐμέ / τὸν Πᾶνα. *Aspis* 98 (prologue) θεὸν οὖσαν οὐκ ἦν εἰκὸς ἀκολουθεῖν ἐμέ. *Aspis* 14 ἐγὼ δ' ὁ παιδαγωγός. *Dysk.* 398 f. κατακέκομμ' ἐγὼ ὁ μάγειρος. Fr. 794 μάλιστα δ' οἱ Γέται ἡμεῖς.

16-19 ἐγένοντο Σωσθένης ...θατέρω: Plaut. *Poen.* 59 ff. (prologue). Carthaginenses fratres patruales duo fuere, summo genere et summis ditibus; eorum alter vivit, alter est mortuos. And *Capt.* 7 (prologue) seni huic fuerunt filii nati duo.

16 Δημέας: this is the name of a father in Menander's *Samia*, *Misoumenos*, and (very probably) *Imbrioi*.

— Σωσθένης: this is a name not found yet in comedy; cf. the Σῶστρατος in the *Dysk.*

17f. εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας... ἔγγμαν οἰκίας: Menander *Dysk.* 14 (prologue) χήραν γυναῖκ' ἔγγμε.

18f. *καὶ γίνεται... αὐτῶν, θυγάτριον δὲ θατέρῳ*: Menander *Dysk.* 19 (prologue) *θυγάτριον αὐτῷ γίνεται.*

20 *ἀποδημία*: Menander *Aspis* 131 (prologue) *μακροτέρων ὁρῶν ἐκείνῳ τὴν ἀποδημίαν.*

— *ἀμφοτέροις ἅμα* (the same in v. 28): the position of *ἅμα* at the end of the verse, Menander *Sam.* 226, 509, 734.

21 *τῶν σωμάτων*: Menander *Sikyon.* 3 (prologue) *ὡς δ' ἐγκρατεῖς ἐγένοντο σωμάτων τριῶν.*

22 *εἰρχθέντος*: not found elsewhere in comedy; it belongs to the juridical vocabulary (e. g. Demosth. 59, 66).

25 *ἐκκλέψαι*: not found elsewhere in comedy; in this sense it is a juridical term (e. g. Lysias 20, 7, Demosten. 24, 80).

26 *καὶ γέγονεν* (cf. v. 18): the *καὶ* after a semicolon in Menander *Dysk.* 12 (prologue) *καὶ τοῦτ' εὐθύς αὐτῷ μεταμέλει. Aspis* 136 (prologue) *καὶ ποιεῖν ἔμελλε τοὺς γάμους νυνί.*

28 *τις ἂν φήσειεν*: (by *τις* a spectator is understood) Menander *Perik.* (prologue) *εἰ τοῦτ' ἐδυσχέρανέ τις.* Cf. Euripides *El.* 50 ff. (prologue) *ὅστις δὲ μ' εἶναι φησιν μῶρον, εἰ λαβῶν νέαν ἐς οἶκους μὴ θιγγάνω..*

The formula found at the end of the *Dysk.* 45-46 and of the *Sikyon.* (23-24) echoes apparently commonplaces of the rhetoric. The end of the speech 14, 41 by Demosthenes is an example of combining the sense expressed at the beginning of the prologue in the Pap. Argentor. 53 and the formula at the end of these Menandrian prologues: "Ἴνα δ', ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, μὴ μακρὰ λέγων ἐνοχλῶ, τὰ κεφάλαι' ὧν συμβουλεύω φράσας ἄπειμι. Cf. *μακρολόγος* (v. 1) and *ῥῆσιν λέγω.....ὀχληρὰν*(v.8f)And *ταῦτ' ἐστί τὰ κεφάλαια, τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα δέ... (Dysk. 45-46, Sikyon. 23-24.*

There is in Lucian another case (*Pseudolog.* 4), where someone asks "Ἐλεγχος, the best of the Menandrian prologues, according to his opinion, to make an introductory speech: "Ἀγε τοίνυν, ὦ προλόγων καὶ δαιμόνων ἄριστε "Ἐλεγγε, ὄρα ὅπως σαφῶς προδιδάξης τοὺς ἀκούοντας ὡς οὐ μάτην... ταῦτα μόνον εἰπὼν καὶ σαφῶς προδιηγησάμενος ἕλεως ἀπιθί¹ ἐκποδῶν, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ἡμῖν κατάλιπε. Lucian evidently not only imitates the vocabulary of New Comedy as well as of the rhetoric, but also shows which were the characteristics of a good prologue: to contain a clear introduction, explaining only the main facts, and to leave the stage having been merciful to the audience, i. e. without having bored them.

1. Cf. in the quotation from Demosthenes (14, 4) *τὰ κεφάλαια φράσας ἄπειμι.* These expressions make, I think, the supplement *πότ' ἄπει]σιν* (Weil) in v. 12 of our text very probable.

Lucian's opinion is based on the content of the Menandrian prologues. It is also notable that, apart from the absence of any sign of a personified Prologus in the Greek comedy, the deities, who were given the important part of the prologue, are treated by Menander more or less like the other persons of his comedy, i. e. like individual characters, so that to impress the audience by being original, sensational and funny. Therefore the success of a prologue was represented in a way as depending on the ability and power of the deity, while the poet appeared responsible for the choice of the right deity. And in the case of the deities of the prologue in New Comedy there was no question in fact of choosing among existing deities so much as it was a matter of creating deities out of abstract ideas, exactly like creating human characters for the drama.

The possibility of the Menandrian authorship was mentioned by Kaibel (op. cit. p. 554), but it was suggested more explicitly by Demianczuk (*Suppl. Com.* p. 97), an imitator of Menander was an alternative possibility, but this possibility was rejected either tacitly or explicitly by all the editors of the text, because they accepted Reizenstein's interpretation¹. But as it is shown Reitzenstein's interpretation is not right; provided that this fragmentary prologue belongs to New Comedy, as it is known to us from Menander and the Latin adaptations, the possibility of the Menandrian authorship is valid. Furthermore the story of this comedy, as it is exposed in the prologue, contains an indication for specifying it. This is not the two brothers — 'Ἀδελφοὶ is a rather common title of comedy and one expects to find brothers in many comedies² — but their two children, the boy and the girl, who are cousins and are naturally expected to be of great importance in the plot of this comedy. Therefore this comedy could be named after them *Anepsioi* (The cousins)³. It is notable that only Menander, as far as it is known, wrote a comedy with his title. The title of Menander's comedy *Anepsioi* is written first in the catalogue of selected plays of the Pap. Brit. Mus. 2562 (Koerte I p. 150) and is mentioned in the catalogue of Menander's plays in alphabetical order of the Pap. Oxy. 2462 (Austin *CGF.* 104). The title *Anepsioi* is found in the inscription

1. Sandbach notes that the Menandrian authorship of Pap. Argentor. 53 is improbable (Menander, *A Comment.* p. 57).

2. E. g. in the *Aspis* there are two brothers, who play very important parts in this comedy.

3. The meaning of 'Ἀνεψιοὶ is here ἀνεψιῶς and ἀνεψιά, like ἀδελφοὶ (=ἀδελφός and ἀδελφή) in Euripides' *El.* 536f.

I. G² 2323 (Didascaliae of comedies produced at the Dionysia c. 215-210) without the poet's name (probably a revival of Menander's *Anepsioi*).

Five fragments exist from Menander's *Anepsioi*; three of them are quoted by Stobaios and the rest by Athenaios (Koerte II 53-57). From the three gnomic quotations in Stobaios, Fr. 53 can fit well in the story of our prologue, but it has a rather general application, because young persons in love exist as a rule in the comedies of the Nea¹. The second gnomic quotation (Fr. 54) can have a probable relation to the story in our prologue: someone says that a sensible son means happiness for his father; on the contrary a daughter is anyway a troublesome possession to her father². If the fathers on their arrival found themselves in trouble, which usually happens in comedy, then the trouble was most likely caused by their children, the boy and the girl, to whom the gnomic verses can apply. The third gnomic quotation (Fr. 57), the fields, which feed men badly, make them brave, can fit to the story: it can be taken as referring to the brothers, who left their home driven by poverty, like Kleostratos in the *Aspis*, but, of course, Fr. 57 also has a wide application. The two quotations from Menander's *Anepsioi* cited by Athenaios (Fr. 55 and 56) attest the use of the words $\pi\alpha\nu\delta\varsigma$ and $\varphi\alpha\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ ³.

Afranius is the only Latin dramatist who wrote a comedy with the title *Consortini* (children of sisters), but the two cousins of our prologue are patruels (children of brothers). The Greek word ἀνεψιοὶ covers both meanings. If Afranius' *Consortini* is an adaptation of Menander's Ἀνεψιοὶ and our prologue belongs in fact to this comedy, then Afranius has changed the story and made the cousins children of sisters instead of brothers. There is only one fragment from Afranius' *Consortini* (Ribbeck *CGF*³ p. 199), in which we read that parents' lives are worth little in their children's eyes when they prefer fear to respect⁴. This quotation can apply to a case of opposition between the generations of parents and children, which is found often in comedies

1. In Fr. 53 someone says that love is by nature deaf to advice and besides it is not easy to beat at the same time youth and the god of love by using reason.

2. The two verses of Fr. 54 are quoted separately. The first is ascribed to Menander without stating the title of the play, and the second verse to Μενάνδρου Ἀνεψιοῖς. They were connected into one quotation by Grotius.

3. The distinction between these words is rather obscure. Fr. 55 is apparently corrupted and Dobree's addition <οἷσ'> is doubtful in Menander's text.

4. See Webster *St. Men*², p. 97.

of the Nea and perhaps here as well in the comedy to which our prologue belongs.

This study of the Pap. Argentero. 53 is concluded with the following summing up of its results: This comic prologue is not preserved in its entire, or almost entire, form, but it is only a part of a prologue. It has affinities with the other existing prologues of New Comedy as far as its content and style are concerned, and therefore its composition can be dated into the time of Menander and the other great poets of New Comedy. It does not give in fact any evidence of a Greek origin of the Terentian prologue, because the criticism against the long prologues taken as a comic invention in the treatment of common places is not directed against any rival poet, and much less can it be in fact a poet's literary opinion. The possibility of a Menandrian authorship is valid and the identification of this text with Menander's *Anepsioi* is suggested as a probability¹.

1. A short form of this paper is published in the Proceedings of the XIV International Congress of Papyrologists. Oxford 24-31 July 1974; Oxford (U. P.) 1975, pp. 73-78 (Graeco-Roman Memoir No. 61).